



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/714,268	11/14/2003	Deborah A. Schade	19400/09003DIV	3868

27530 7590 12/27/2006
NELSON MULLINS RILEY & SCARBOROUGH, LLP
1320 MAIN STREET, 17TH FLOOR
COLUMBIA, SC 29201

EXAMINER

WANG, SHENGJUN

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

1617

SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD OF RESPONSE	MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
3 MONTHS	12/27/2006	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire 6 MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/714,268

Applicant(s)

SCHADE ET AL.

Examiner

Shengjun Wang

Art Unit

1617

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☐ Responsive to communication(s) filed on ____.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-5, 19 and 20 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) ____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) ____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-5, 19 and 20 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) ____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) ____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on ____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. ____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date ____.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. ____.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: ____.

DETAILED ACTION

This application is a divisional application of 09/381,484.

Double Patenting Rejections

1. The nonstatutory double patenting rejection is based on a judicially created doctrine grounded in public policy (a policy reflected in the statute) so as to prevent the unjustified or improper timewise extension of the "right to exclude" granted by a patent and to prevent possible harassment by multiple assignees. A nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting rejection is appropriate where the conflicting claims are not identical, but at least one examined application claim is not patentably distinct from the reference claim(s) because the examined application claim is either anticipated by, or would have been obvious over, the reference claim(s). See, e.g., *In re Berg*, 140 F.3d 1428, 46 USPQ2d 1226 (Fed. Cir. 1998); *In re Goodman*, 11 F.3d 1046, 29 USPQ2d 2010 (Fed. Cir. 1993); *In re Longi*, 759 F.2d 887, 225 USPQ 645 (Fed. Cir. 1985); *In re Van Ornum*, 686 F.2d 937, 214 USPQ 761 (CCPA 1982); *In re Vogel*, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970); and *In re Thorington*, 418 F.2d 528, 163 USPQ 644 (CCPA 1969).

A timely filed terminal disclaimer in compliance with 37 CFR 1.321(c) or 1.321(d) may be used to overcome an actual or provisional rejection based on a nonstatutory double patenting ground provided the conflicting application or patent either is shown to be commonly owned with this application, or claims an invention made as a result of activities undertaken within the scope of a joint research agreement.

Effective January 1, 1994, a registered attorney or agent of record may sign a terminal disclaimer. A terminal disclaimer signed by the assignee must fully comply with 37 CFR 3.73(b).

2. Claims 1-5, and 19-20 are provisionally rejected on the ground of nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1-5, and 21 of copending Application No. 09/381,484. Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because the claims herein substantially overlap the claims in '484. The claims herein differ from those in '484 only in specifying that DHA and ARA is in a nutritional product or nutritional supplement, and be substantially free of EPA. Since claims in 484 do not require EPA, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, to use a formula without EPA. This is a provisional obviousness-type double patenting rejection because the conflicting claims have not in fact been patented.

Art Unit: 1617

3. Claims 1-5, 19-20 are provisionally rejected on the ground of nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1-40 of copending Application No. 10/713,936. Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because the claims herein differ from those in '936 in that it require substantially free of EPA. Since claims of '936 do not require EPA, it would have been obvious to not use EPA in the composition having ARA and DHA in '936.

This is a provisional obviousness-type double patenting rejection because the conflicting claims have not in fact been patented.

Claim Rejections 35 U.S.C. 112

4. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

5. Claims 1-5, 19-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

6. The term "substantially" in claim 1 is a relative term, which renders the claim indefinite. The term "substantially" is not defined by the claim, the specification does not provide a standard for ascertaining the requisite degree, and one of ordinary skill in the art would not be reasonably apprised of the scope of the invention. The claim define the employed composition be "substantially free" of EPA, however, the claims or the specification fails to define the meaning of "substantially". The specification cites "substantially free" as most preferred over "less than 5 mg/100 kcal." See, page 7, lines 2-11 in the specification. It is not clear if "less than 5 mg/100

Art Unit: 1617

kcal” will meet the limitation of “substantially free”, or it require “less than 3, 2, or 1 mg/100 kcal”? The claims are indefinite as to the amount of EPA in the employed composition.

Claim Rejections 35 U.S.C. § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1-5, and 19-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kyle (U.S. Patent 5,374,657, IDS) in view of Crozier G.L. et al. (Monatschrift Für Kinderheilkunde, Vol. 143, No. 7, 1995, page 95-98, with English translation, IDS) and Schweikhardt et al (EP 0231904, IDS).

Kyle teaches an infant formula comprising DHA and ARA in comparable amounts of DHA and ARA in human breast milk. The ratio of ARA:DHA is about 3:1 to 2:1. See the claims and the examples in columns 13-16. Kyle also teaches that the presence of ARA and DHA in infant food is critical for a healthy growth for infants. See, particularly, column 1, lines 29-53. It is also disclosed that a variety of sources may provide ARA and DHA, including organ fat from beef and pork, fish oil, egg yolk oil etc. See, col. 1, line 54-63. Kyle also discloses that the ratio of ARA to EPA is about 20:1, and the presence of EPA in the formulation would depress the biosynthesis of ARA. See, column 1, lines 29-38, column 3, lines 43-49.

Kyle does not teach expressly the administration of the infant formula to preterm infants, or the particular ratio of ARA: DHA, and the particular amounts of ARA: DHA herein, or substantially free of EPA.

However, Crozier et al. teaches that the presence of ARA and DHA in food is particularly important for preterm infants to proper growth and development because they are unable to synthesize sufficient ARA and DHA. See, particularly, the summary. Schweikhardt et al. teach to employ ARA and DHA enriched infant formula for feeding infant, including preterm infant, wherein the ration of ARA and DHA is essentially the same as herein claimed. Schweikhardt et al. teach that newborn baby, particularly the preterm baby, is dependent on exogenous supply of ARA and DHA. See, particularly, page 1, the third paragraph and the claims of the English translation. Schweikhardt et al. further teach an oil mixture for infant formula comprising 0.12 – 1% of ARA and 0.05 – 0.5% of DHA. Schweikhardt et al. teach an infant formula comprising 1.5% protein, 3.6% lipid, and 7.2% of carbohydrate. These amount would translated to about 5-42 mg/kcal of ARA and 2.1 to 21 mg/kcal of DHA in a infant formula (based on 100 ml of infant formula contain 3.6 g of oil mixture and 120 ml of infant formula provide 100 kcal of energy (see table 1 at pages 5-6 of the translation).

Therefore, it would have been prima facie obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art, at the time the claimed the invention was made, to make a infant formula with the particular amount of ARA and DHA herein, with substantially free of EPA and use the same for feeding preterm infant.

A person of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to make a infant formula with the particular amount of ARA and DHA herein and use the same for feeding preterm infant, because preterm infants are known to be in need of food with sufficient amount of ARA and DHA and the particular amounts of ARA and DHA herein are overlapped with the amounts range known in the art. The particular amount herein is considered obvious variation within the

Art Unit: 1617

known range. Further, optimization of the amounts of ARA and DHA, or the formula as whole, particularly for preterm infants are considered within the skill of artisan since the criticality of ARA and DHA for preterm infant growth is known in the art. Note the claimed ratio of ARA:DHA is within the broad range claimed by Kyle. See, particularly, claim 20 in Kyle. Further, one of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to control the amount of EPA in the formula to the least amount since EPA is not to depress the biosynthesis of ARA.


As to the limitation of “weight gain,” note the claims are directed to a formula and the ultimate utility, i.e., feeding preterm infant with formula comprising ARA and DHA. Such utility has been fairly suggested by the cited references as discussed above. The intended function of the utility herein fails to distinguish the claimed method from what have been suggested by the prior art. Particularly, the fact that applicant has recognized another advantage which would flow naturally from following the suggestion of the prior art cannot be the basis for patentability when the differences would otherwise be obvious. See *Ex parte Obiaya*, 227 USPQ 58, 60 (Bd. Pat. App. & Inter. 1985). It is well settled patent law that mode of action elucidation does not impart patentable moment to otherwise old and obvious subject matter. Applicant’s attention is directed to *In re Swinehart*, (169 USPQ 226 at 229) where the Court of Customs and Patent Appeals stated “is elementary that the mere recitation of a newly discovered function or property, inherently possessed by thing in the prior art, does not cause a claim drawn to those things to distinguish over the prior art.” The ultimate utility for the claimed composition is old and well known rendering the claimed subject matter obvious to the skilled artisan. It would follow therefore that the instant claims are properly rejected under 35 USC 103.

Art Unit: 1617

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Shengjun Wang whose telephone number is (571) 272-0632. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday to Friday from 7:00 am to 3:30 pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Sreeni Padmanabhan, can be reached on (571) 272-0629. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).


Shengjun Wang
Primary Examiner
Art Unit 1617